§ 23.574

- (i) The maximum disbonds of each bonded joint consistent with the capability to withstand the loads in paragraph (a)(3) of this section must be determined by analysis, tests, or both. Disbonds of each bonded joint greater than this must be prevented by design features; or
- (ii) Proof testing must be conducted on each production article that will apply the critical limit design load to each critical bonded joint; or
- (iii) Repeatable and reliable non-destructive inspection techniques must be established that ensure the strength of each joint.
- (6) Structural components for which the damage tolerance method is shown to be impractical must be shown by component fatigue tests, or analysis supported by tests, to be able to withstand the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected in service. Sufficient component, subcomponent, element, or coupon tests must be done to establish the fatigue scatter factor and the environmental effects. Damage up to the threshold of detectability and ultimate load residual strength capability must be considered in the demonstration.
- (b) Metallic airframe structure. If the applicant elects to use §23.571(c) or §23.572(a)(3), then the damage tolerance evaluation must include a determination of the probable locations and modes of damage due to fatigue, corrosion, or accidental damage. Damage at multiple sites due to fatigue must be included where the design is such that this type of damage can be expected to occur. The evaluation must incorporate repeated load and static analyses supported by test evidence. The extent of damage for residual strength evaluation at any time within the operational life of the airplane must be consistent with the initial detectability and subsequent growth under repeated loads. The residual strength evaluation must show that the remaining structure is able to withstand critical limit flight loads, considered as ultimate, with the extent of detectable damage consistent with the results of the damage tolerance evaluations. For pressurized cabins, the following load must be withstood:

- (1) The normal operating differential pressure combined with the expected external aerodynamic pressures applied simultaneously with the flight loading conditions specified in this part, and
- (2) The expected external aerodynamic pressures in 1g flight combined with a cabin differential pressure equal to 1.1 times the normal operating differential pressure without any other load.

[Doc. No. 26269, 58 FR 42163, Aug. 6, 1993; 58 FR 51970, Oct. 5, 1993, as amended by Amdt. 23-48, 61 FR 5147, Feb. 9, 1996; 73 FR 19746, Apr. 11, 2008]

§ 23.574 Metallic damage tolerance and fatigue evaluation of commuter category airplanes.

For commuter category airplanes—

- (a) Metallic damage tolerance. An evaluation of the strength, detail design, and fabrication must show that catastrophic failure due to fatigue, corrosion, defects, or damage will be avoided throughout the operational life of the airplane. This evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the provisions of §23.573, except as specified in paragraph (b) of this section, for each part of the structure that could contribute to a catastrophic failure.
- (b) Fatigue (safe-life) evaluation. Compliance with the damage tolerance requirements of paragraph (a) of this section is not required if the applicant establishes that the application of those requirements is impractical for a particular structure. This structure must be shown, by analysis supported by test evidence, to be able to withstand the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected during its service life without detectable cracks. Appropriate safe-life scatter factors must be applied.

[Doc. No. 27805, 61 FR 5148, Feb. 9, 1996]

§ 23.575 Inspections and other procedures.

Each inspection or other procedure, based on an evaluation required by §§ 23.571, 23.572, 23.573 or 23.574, must be established to prevent catastrophic failure and must be included in the Limitations Section of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness required by §23.1529.

[Doc. No. 27805, 61 FR 5148, Feb. 9, 1996]